

Attorney Emile initiated the interview with a description of the invention in the application and a statement of how it differed from the prior art references Erten and Obrador. Attorney Emile then requested that if the attached proposed amendments did not sufficiently distinguish the claims from the cited prior art, that the office suggest more suitable claim language that would place the application in condition for allowance. The office explained that examiner Fitzpatrick did not have the authority nor the responsibility to make such a suggestion, but that the combination of Erten and Obrador taught all the limitations of the invention as claimed, and particularly for claim 1, Erten taught all the limitations of claim one in its current state. The office acknowledged that there were differences between the invention as disclosed and the aforementioned references, but that these differences were not claimed. Attorney Emile suggested that the limitations pertaining to the post-processing of the multi-media data be claimed. The office suggested that a clear distinction between the speaker and participants in the claims, which explicitly stated that a participant was not a speaker but only a listener, was also needed. After reviewing the language present in claim 1, Attorney Emile agreed with this suggestion.